

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, and 18 have been amended herein. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated September 3, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that computer programs are non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 18 have been amended herein to recite computer readable media encoded with a computer program. Further, Applicant notes that claim 16 has also been similar amended, though claim 16 had not been rejected. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments fully address all of the Examiner's concerns and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6, 16, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of Roelans (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

A method for creating a presentation including interactive media relating to polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections, said method comprising:

creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server...

generating a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server;

replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server and

recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user's identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

Applicant respectfully submits that that none of the applied references teaches “creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server...generating a list of available polls or quizzes stored on the remote server” and “replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server”.

Further, claim 1 recites “recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user's identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation”. In other words, an exemplary method consistent with claim 1 involves monitoring not just how long a user viewed the entire presentation, but how long each section of the presentation was viewed. This allows, for example, a moderator to determine if the critical sections were reviewed in depth.

None of the applied references teach monitoring how much time was spent viewing each section. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied references teach “recording information regarding an end-user’s usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user’s identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation” as claimed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for at least these reasons.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites, inter alia:

A method for playing a presentation including polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections, said method comprising:...

sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream of data;

selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end user;

pausing said stream of data when one of the frames contains placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the remote server;

displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end-user;... and

recording information regarding an end-user’s usage of said presentation, said information including an end-user’s identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end user on a poll, how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references applied by the Examiner does not disclose or make obvious “selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end user; pausing said stream of data when one of the frames contains placeholder data related to at

least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the remote server” and “displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end-user” as claimed.

Further, similar to claim 1 discussed above, claim 2 recites “recording information regarding an end-user’s usage of said presentation, said information including an end-user’s identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end user on a poll, how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.” Thus, like claim 1, an exemplary method consistent with claim 2 involves monitoring not just how long a user viewed the entire presentation, but how long each section of the presentation was viewed. Again this allows, for example, a moderator to determine if the critical sections were reviewed in depth.

As discussed above, none of the applied references teach this aspect. Therefore, Applicant submits that the applied references also do not disclose “recording information regarding an end-user’s usage of said presentation, said information including an end-user’s identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end user on a poll, how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason. For all the above discussed reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 3

Claims 3, 8-14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Coughlin (US 2003/0034999) in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 3 recite, *inter alia*:

A method of communicating between a presentation program; said program being stored on a computer readable medium executable by computer, and a remote server including interactive media when a presentation is being viewed by a user, said method comprising:

communicating a request for the presentation to a remote server, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections;

receiving a stream of data from the server, including placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by a user;

pausing the stream of data when the placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz is received;

retrieving the at least one poll and quiz related to the received placeholder data from the remote server;...

recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information includes a user's identity, how far the user watched said presentation, what the user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation ,...

Applicant respectfully submits that the references applied by the Examiner do not disclose or make obvious “communicating a request for a presentation to a remote server...; receiving a stream of data from the server, including placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by a user; pausing the stream of data when the placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz is received” and “retrieving the at least one poll and quiz related to the received placeholder data from the remote server” as claimed.

Further, for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2, Applicant also submits that none of applied references teach “recording information regarding

each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information includes a user's identity, how far the user watched said presentation, what the user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the user on a poll, , and how much elapsed time the user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation" as also claimed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for at least these reasons.

Claims 4, 5, and 15

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelans further in view of Joao as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Coughlin (US 2003/0034999). Further, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelans further in view of Joao as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470). Further, claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Coughlin in view of Roelens, further in view of Owens, further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) and further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4, 5, and 15 depend from claims 1 and 3, which have been shown above to be patentable over the applied references discussed above. The other references cited against these claims do not cure the deficiencies of the Applied References discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 3, 2009

/Michael C. Jones/
Michael C. Jones
Registration No. 63,266